

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 4-15 are currently pending. Claims 1-3 and 6-9 stand rejected and Claims 4 and 5 are objected to. Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3, 5, and 8. Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 10-15 are new with Claim 11 being in independent form. No new matter has been added.

Information Disclosure Statement

As requested by the Examiner, the references originally cited in the Search Report, filed June 6, 2006, are being submitted herewith as a separate listing on form PTO/SB/08A, in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(1).

Claim Objections

Claim 8 stands objected to because of informalities. Accordingly, the language “one of the” has been deleted to comply with a previous amendment to other claims in this regard. Additionally, “of roof” on line 3 of Claim 8 has been amended to the language “of the roof.” Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

§112 rejections

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 recites the limitation “so-called”. The Examiner states that it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention.

Applicants have amended Claim 3 to delete the language “so-called roof strut (7)” and added Claim 10 which further defines the “front transverse support of said roof support structure” of Claim 3 to be a “roof strut (7).” Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

§102 rejection

Claims 1-3 and 6-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Vetter (US 1,298,836).

Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable claim 4. Accordingly, with the present Amendment, the claimed invention is not anticipated by Vetter, for at least this reason, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 3, and 6-9 ultimately depend from allowable Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2, 3, and 6-9 are not anticipated by Vetter, for at least this reason, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 4 and 5 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and stated that Claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 4 depended directly from independent Claim 1. The Applicants have rewritten independent Claim 1 to include the limitations of allowable Claim 4, which depended directly Claim 1. Claim 5 has been rewritten to depend from rewritten Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 11-15 have been added. Support for claims 11-15 found in paragraphs [0018]-[0023] and in Figure 2. No new matter has been added.

All rejections and objections having been addressed, it is therefore respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Schonhorst et al.

By 

Christopher W. Quinn

Reg. No. 38,274

Date: 3/12/08

QUINN LAW GROUP, PLLC
39555 Orchard Hill Place, Ste. 520
Novi, Michigan 48375
Phone: 248-380-9300
Fax: 248-380-8968